

Mingailė Jurkutė

## SOVIET MANIPULATION OF THE MEMORY OF THE LITHUANIAN GUERRILLA WAR

DOI: 10.1515/ppsr-2015-0025

### Author

Mingailė Jurkutė is a Candidate for PhD in History at Vilnius University. Her research interests focus on Lithuanian guerrilla war, social and cultural history of soviet Lithuania, historical consciousness and collective memory.

**e-mail:** mingaile@gmail.com

### Abstract

The paper analyses the transformation of the collective memory of the Lithuanian guerrilla war (1944–1953) during the Soviet occupation. The problem that arises on observation of the collective memory of Guerrilla war period is the disparity between the sense and meaning of the guerrilla war as it was happening and the shapes of its memory that emerged at the beginning of the perestrojka and the reestablishment of the independence. The shift from the high support for the resistance and its goals in the 50's to the ignorance of it can be observed, as well as the changing of the perception of it as the fight between two sovereign countries (Lithuania and the SSRS) towards the internal conflict in Lithuanian society. The paper raises the question about the reasons for this transformation and the impact of Soviet propaganda (expanding it to the scope of “historical culture” in Jorn Rūsen terms). The research of one peculiar sphere of soviet historical culture, that is, the building of monuments and carrying out of the related memorial practices, proved, that the forms and the intensity of the development of the soviet narrative of the Lithuanian Guerrilla war were poor and inconsequential. Such a results support the hypothesis that the soviet historical culture was not decisive in transformation of a collective memory, and that suggests to pay more attention not to the actions of the regime, but to sociological, sociohistorical and anthropological research of Lithuanian soviet society.

**Keywords:** Lithuanian guerrilla war, Lithuanian guerrilla resistance, Soviet Lithuania, Soviet historical culture, collective memory.

The image of the Lithuanian guerrilla war went through several rather distinct transformative turning points that can be located in the popular historical memory. There was the guerrilla war period (1944-1953), the period of the profound sovietisation (1953-1985), and the free discourse, which started with *Perestrojka* (~1985(8)) and still continues now. Yet, a closer look reveals a recent new significant turning point that can be distinguished around 2010, which differs from the previous one by an increased interest in the topic, especially by the younger generation.

The whole history of the collective memory of the Lithuanian guerrilla war is difficult to analyse and coherently compare throughout all the periods, mostly because

of the disparity in the articulation of the images of each of these periods. This is the problem of the disparity of historical sources. From the first period there are two main groups of sources that convey the popular image of the guerrilla war – the partisan documents and the folklore of the resistance (songs of the resistance). Given the high popular support which the resistance enjoyed until mass collectivisation (1948; 1949), this image could be considered to be dominant in the society. In the last period, the period of *perestroika*, and the Second Republic of Lithuania, we find many diverse representations of the image of the Lithuanian guerrilla war. Different sources from different periods require separate scientific approaches with different methodologies (from folkloristics to sociology), which makes comparison more difficult.

This article aims to explore the second period, the period of profound sovietisation, which is by far the most complicated to study. It is characterised by total control of the public sphere and a similar level of control of the private sphere. Public discourse was fully controlled and dominated by official propaganda, and even private chats “in the kitchen” were far less free in Brezhnev’s times than people would like to remember. This creates a lack of representation of an authentic image of the guerrilla war in historical sources. The living memory of the Soviet period is very difficult to track down, despite the huge transformation that it underwent at the time.

The lack of authentic representations of this memory narrows the research down to one layer of the mechanisms of functioning of the collective memory, that is – to the Soviet policy of memory towards the Lithuanian guerrilla war, which in Lithuanian historiography is considered to be crucial for the transformation. This means both the plans and accomplished actions of the authorities.

In order to avoid listing all the decisions and decrees (and thus falling into the domain of political history), we will proceed with a short presentation of the theoretical approach, the main concepts and the logic behind this research.

### **Several Theoretical Remarks**

The Soviet memory policy towards the Lithuanian guerrilla war is here considered one component in the whole process of collective memory formation and functioning. In the most general sense, collective memory shows how the communities construct their identity based on their common knowledge of the past. Collectivity of memory is created only through *sharing* of individual memories.

Since its heyday in the 1970s, the topic of collective memory has been developed in sociology, history, anthropology, psychology, art history, literary criticism, and political science. Our research is based on the conception of collective memory invented and developed in sociology. The pioneering ideas of Maurice Halbwachs in 1925 showed the general path of understanding the concept of collective memory as a socially constructed shared interpretation of the past. Halbwachs was preoccupied with the question how an *individual* remembers *in society*, and insisted that the social factors are crucial for the existence of (individual) memory – all memories are not only acquired, but also actualised in the community. Memories

of individuals are influenced by the groups to which they belong. Halbwachs even went as far as saying that it is impossible to acquire any memory outside of the community. He named it “social frameworks of memory” (Halbwachs 1992 [1925]; 1980 [1950]).

Sociologists of memory describe memory as a dynamic process of constant (re)construction of memory and aim at specifying how this process operates within specific social institutions.<sup>1</sup> As it was stated above, in our research the spectrum of social institutions is narrowed down to those created and maintained by the Soviet political authorities.<sup>2</sup>

Neurophysiological studies strengthen this approach and refute the Freudian conception of memory, which considered memory to be a specific repository of images that are possible to call up wholesale at a later date with the help of psychoanalysis (Hutton 1994). During recollection, however, the neural network combines information from the present environment with patterns that have been stored from the past, thus deriving a given “memoir” – timely “image of the past” (Schatter 1995). The given memoir, concrete “image of the past”, should in theory be different in every new action of recollection. Thus, memory can be seen as an equation with variables and a constant. A real event in the past (the lived experience) is a constant, whereas the present environment (present conditions) represent variables, and the sum of both is a given memoir in a given time.

The most controversial issue in the field of studies of memory is the ultimate impact and significance of each of these aspects. Without delving deeper into this discussion, we will only acknowledge the fact of the general flux of memory and that even previously introduced variables can become constants in the equation (e. g., through the process of learning; the effect of mass media,<sup>3</sup> etc.).

A collective memory only exists in the form of a narrative. Therefore, in the research we will search for narrative forms, as well as for values and symbols, which were used for constructing narrative(s) of the Lithuanian guerrilla war during the Soviet period.

It is handy to remember that the socialist regime started as an attempt to embody a grand narrative – to implement the socioeconomic theory of Marxism. This means that narrativity is one of the central features of the official Soviet culture. It also means that it is important to demonstrate what particular place was given to the official narrative of the Lithuanian guerrilla war in the grand Soviet historical narrative.

In the Soviet Union, every field was under strict subordination to the Communist party, which realised its will through various executive institutions. Every possible field was governed by a central institution, and the implementation of its orders were

---

<sup>1</sup> This approach encompasses institutional fields from politics and media to arts and other cultural forms and is too voluminous to even begin to report, good starting places are surveys and overviews of the field, e. g., Olick and Robbins 1998, Olick 1999, Russel 2006, Kansteiner 2002.

<sup>2</sup> Although there is a huge attention on how political power functions in the process of collective memory formation in scientific literature, the field is dominated by the studies of the mechanisms in nationalism, other types of state order, e.g. socialist system, receives a far less attention. Still the best studies of political power influence to the processes of collective memory formation and functioning are done in Germany, which experienced both totalitarian regimes.

<sup>3</sup> Epizodinės ir semantinės atminties skirtis

realised and supervised by a variety of lower level agencies of maintenance and control. This system of governance calls for a two-level approach where we will search for: a) the Soviet exemplary historical narrative of the Lithuanian guerrilla war: the official Soviet version of the events of the Lithuanian guerrilla war, coined by respective highest institutions; b) the dissemination of the official version: the forms, channels, and methods by which the official version reached the masses. The “b” level could be visualised like a net, which represents the frequency of encounter with the Soviet version of the Lithuanian guerrilla war. This does not allow us to draw conclusions about the direct outcomes of the Soviet policy of memory, but it reveals the area of possible impact.

Thus, this research aims to track down the Soviet manipulation of memory of the Lithuanian guerrilla war through the power structures (institutions) of the Soviet authorities. Analysing the whole spectrum of channels, through which the implementation of the Soviet version of the Lithuanian guerrilla war could be carried out, is too broad task for this article. For this reason the object of this article is narrowed down to one string of the net. Thus, the process represented in this article encompass the entire “a” level and one range of the “b” level – the material monuments and mnemonic practises exercised around it. We believe that the approach presented in this article reveals the viability of further research in this field.

There are many studies on the efforts by the Soviet government to alter the Lithuanian national identity, however there were no efforts made to systematically review the Soviet policy of memory towards the Lithuanian guerrilla war, despite the fact that there are many speculations about the impact of this policy. The same could be said about the biggest work in this field so far, the doctoral thesis of Bernardas Gailius “The Guerrilla War of 1944–1953 in the Historical, Political and Legal Culture of Contemporary Lithuania” (Gailius 2009). We can agree with the majority of the propositions of the thesis and the main idea behind it – that the guerrilla war is understood inadequately due to the lasting results of sovietisation. Yet it is disappointing that even though the thesis raises the question of forging historical memory, the historic layer itself is touched on only very briefly. Analysis is limited to several superficial phenomena without analysing the totality and depth of the practices of (re)creating memory. Comprehensive empirical research is necessary to arrive at a fuller picture.

## **Sovietisation of Memory**

### **Oblivion: A hitch of authentic narrative**

We have to start with the mechanism of forming (or non-formation) memory.

The totalitarian regime of the Soviet Union managed to achieve a level of control over the population where individuals stopped communicating freely (authentically) and sharing their experiences even in their private life and private relationships. Due to an active mechanism of trauma (Gailienė 2004; 2008) and because of the state repression apparatus, this process of “staying silent” also went on in Soviet Russia (Figs 2007). The

same process repeated itself in the countries that were annexed after the Second World War. In Lithuania, the political prisoners, the exiles, the participants of armed resistance, and those who witnessed the resistance (all in all, the majority of Lithuanian population) stopped talking about it. Our study shows that the story was not silenced completely, as the members of the generation that went through the period of war, repressions, and resistance, and experienced all of it personally, did discuss it sometimes amongst themselves, but would not tell the younger generation.<sup>4</sup> The scholars studying the guerrilla war still face this problem of “silence” even after 20 years of independence.<sup>5</sup>

This means that the process of collective memory formation was damaged at the very beginning. According to Paul Ricoeur, a precondition for any kind of memory is a narrative: a repeated act of telling a story, by which the teller expresses the event for the listener. Once the process of spontaneous telling is damaged, the collective memory ceases to function (Ricoeur 2004). The memory that does not have a structure of a narrative is very fragile and open to manipulation.

This presumption is supported by the public discourse that became freer in *perestroika* and during *Sąjūdis* (the Lithuanian Movement for Independence in 1988-1990). In the discourse, the topic of fights for freedom appeared later than the topics of Stalinist repressions and exile of the same period, and it immediately sparked very heated debates that rarely went above the level of discussing what happened in “my back yard”.<sup>6</sup>

The situation of “silence” after the war was convenient for the LSSR government, and probably even very desirable. However, there came a *thaw* when Khrushchev consolidated power and encouraged Stalinist crimes to be disclosed, and Lithuania saw a return of several segments of society – exiles, political prisoners, and ex-members of the armed resistance – who were not welcome by the leaders of the Lithuanian Communist Party (LCP). The party leaders of the brand new Soviet republics, where the armed resistance had been put down and the Soviet government consolidated only very recently, did not want to have any discussions about the illegitimacy of their actions or rehabilitation of the actions of the repressed. It was a very unwelcome topic, and, given the possibility of a repetition – even a dangerous topic. The events in Hungary further increased these moods as well as the fear of a recurring armed resistance. The LCP government did not hurry to implement *thaw* policies. Lithuanians were the ethnic group that stayed the longest in the Gulag system, and for a few years the Lithuanians who came back from exile were forbidden from registering their place of residence in Lithuania. Thus, Lithuanian minorities grew in neighbouring countries, such as Latvia and the Kaliningrad Oblast (Anušauskas, Banionis and Bauža 2007, 313-352). After several years the passive suppression of memory was replaced by an active reinterpretation of the events – forging.

---

<sup>4</sup> Data from an unpublished interview in the private archive of the author.

<sup>5</sup> The last time the author met this type of “silence” was in the summer of 2013 during research on the guerrilla movement in north-eastern Lithuania.

<sup>6</sup> Gailius is right to note that in the historiography of the Lithuanian guerrilla war, the details became more prominent than the whole, and the depth and scope of research became more important than conceptual understanding (Gailius 2009, 6).

## The Official Soviet Discourse: the exemplary historical narrative

In May 12, 1958, the bureau of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee (LCP CC) adopted a decision on “The use of archival documents to compromise the ex-members of the resistance” (Bogušauškas and Streikus 2005, 264-266). This decision aimed at wide and combined actions. The most important institutions responsible for history policy – the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic (LSSR) Academy of Sciences, the LCP CC Institute of Party History, the LSSR Central State Archive – were encouraged to collect the “facts that disclose that the policies of the bourgeoisie nationalists were aimed against the People, and show their crimes and cruelties” (Bogušauškas and Streikus 2005, 265) and to use them for propaganda purposes. The wideness of the programme was to be ensured by obliging the museums of history and revolution, and the cities’ and districts’ LCP executive committees to participate in implementation. There were complaints that neither the Lithuanian Leninist Young Communist League (*Komsomol*<sup>7</sup>) nor the trade unions, nor the Fellowship for promoting politics and science (*Žinijos draugija*), nor other scientific and education organisations participate enough in the efforts – meaning that they should participate more. All in all, this meant an order to reinterpret the narrative of the guerrilla war by finding a suitable place for it in LSSR history and by creating an exemplary historical narrative. This task fell on the professionals and institutions responsible for producing Marxist history. Various organisations responsible for the dissemination and support of communist ideas had to disseminate and enforce the narrative in various areas of education and everyday life – thus make it accessible for ordinary Soviet citizens. The repetitions of the official story were forced upon the masses using various kinds of information channels, including education and leisure institutions.

First of all, the approved subjects of Lithuanian history had to be included into the narrative of Marxist history, and they had to be reinterpreted by and adapted to the main aim of communist history – to explain the unavoidable march of humanity (and in this case – the Lithuanian people) towards establishing Communism. Aurimas Švedas comprehensively analysed the place and function of history in the structure of sciences in the LSSR (Švedas 2009, 13-21). Officially, history fell into the domain of the Institute of History at the LSSR Academy of Sciences, Vincas Kapsukas State University, and Vilnius Pedagogical University. However, all the real decisions on how Lithuanian history should look like were taken by LCP using the Institute of Party History, which was its main instrument in history policy. The Institute played a key role in creating suitable terms and phrases for the party leadership to discuss the historical processes of the 19th and the 20th-century Lithuanian history. The “scholars” of the Institute managed to use Marxist rhetoric to discuss, alter, and forge the most painful subjects of Lithuanian history. They also presented all kinds of reports for the LCPC, participated in preparing general courses on Lithuanian history, and reviewed the texts of colleagues at the Institute of History that touched upon “dangerous” issues of 19th and the 20th-century history. The Institute of Party History was at the same time an author creating the image of the guerrilla war and an overseer watching over its implementation.

---

<sup>7</sup> The best-known abbreviation for this organisation – Komsomol – comes from the official Russian title *Ленинский коммунистический союз молодежи* (rus. Ленинский Коммунистический союз молодежи).

The guerrilla resistance was considered to be one of the most dangerous subjects. Even though the above-mentioned decision is pompously addressed at a lot of institutions and orders them to “increase the efforts in fact-finding, collection of archival documents and noting down the witness’ reports”, a carefully selected team of professionals was selected instead of institutions or organisations to implement the project of exemplary historical narrative. A commission was formed, including J. Olekas (head of Culture, Science, and Schools unit at LCP CC), L. Martavičius (vice-chairman of LSSR KGB), Eusiejus Rozauskas (Head of Archives unit at the LSSR Council of Ministers), Genrikas Zimanas (the executive secretary of the official *Tiesa*<sup>8</sup>), Juozas Banaitis (Minister of Culture), Romas Šarmaitis (the director of the Institute of Party History at LCP CC), Jonas Karosas (The chief editor of the journal *Komunistas* [*The Communist*]), Juozas Pajaujas (The director of the publishing house of Political and Scientific literature), and the chairman of the commission, Vladas Niunka (the secretary of LCP CC). The activities included in the programme range from selecting documents (and material evidence) in the state security archives, to a propaganda dissemination campaign. It anticipated the structure of the forthcoming Soviet Lithuanian story of the guerrilla war that would fit in the already established scheme of explaining history. A three-volume collection of documents and articles was planned to represent the period of “bourgeoisie hegemony, the Hitlerian occupation and the Soviet government in Lithuania, and to show the workmen’s struggle for establishing the victory of the Soviet government and establishing Socialism in Lithuania” (Bogušauškas and Streikus 2005, 266).

The story was implemented with the publication of a series of original KGB documents and essays<sup>9</sup> *Faktai kaltina*<sup>10</sup> (*Facts Accuse*). The series established the approved and mandatory story of the Lithuanian guerrilla war. It was included in *The History of Lithuanian SSR* prepared by Juozas Žiugžda (Žiugžda 1958), and in various museum expositions,<sup>11</sup> textbooks, programmes of extracurricular activity (including the programmes of children recreation camps, youth tourist camps etc.), there were feature films,<sup>12</sup> literature and poetry<sup>13</sup> made, and monuments built for the victims and heroes of the post-war period. All these efforts were accompanied by an intensive propaganda campaign in the press.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Local equivalent of all-union official Pravda (rus. Правда).

<sup>9</sup> There is no word corresponding to this genre in English. *Ocherk* (rus. очерк, lith. *apybraiža*) in the Soviet encyclopaedia is defined as a literary genre, reciting single sharp conflict with quick denouement; it deals not with personal, but with mainly social and moral conflicts in society; it has features both of literature and journalism. In reality, *ocherky* were being used as supplements or substitutes of documentary sources, which was their function in the series *Faktai kaltina*. *Ocherk* differs from an essay in its emotionality and instructive tone.

<sup>10</sup> Eleven books were published in 1960-1966. There was also a special English issue on the Holocaust in Lithuania (Baranauskas and Rukšėnas 1970).

<sup>11</sup> The main exposition was at the Museum of the Revolution, which had a rich collection of guerrilla items and documents. However, all local museums had to prepare a similar exposition according to this example.

<sup>12</sup> Eight feature films were produced in 1960-1979 that depicted the period according to the official cannon.

<sup>13</sup> Several poems and cycles of poems, three plays, seven novels and about 15 novellas were published between 1956 and the 1970s.

<sup>14</sup> For almost a decade, the main national newspapers and the local press at least a few times a month had articles titled “Bloody murderers”, or “We will never forget, never forgive”.

The exemplary narrative genetically grew out of several subjects, and it underwent several transformations from the decision to create it until the end of the Soviet period. The subjects can be conditionally divided and named by their most common keywords: the Bandits, the Bourgeoisie Nationalists, and the Kulaks.

The image of the Bandit was implemented from the very beginning of armed resistance. They were bloodthirsty, subhuman killers, whose actions were pointless and based on blind instinct. The Bandits were outside history – they lurked at the outskirts of society and history, and did not play any role in any understandable system. The *Faktai kaltina* series and the press campaign that went with it emphasised this subject of pointless, meaningless massacre.

The Bourgeoisie Nationalists, on the contrary, were a historical Marxist concept. They were subjects of history, and played a specific role in the development of the pre-war Republic of Lithuania and Capitalist World. According to the Marxist structure, the bourgeoisie is an international force that is fighting the proletariat, which is also international. Thus, this scheme ignores the element of statehood that was very important for the guerrillas, and it underplays their movement. In the Lithuanian Republic, the Lithuanian bourgeoisie were only servants to the Western capitalists, so they continued to serve the “Hitlerian” government during the Great War, and once Germany was crushed, they started serving other imperialists. In this way, the Lithuanian guerrillas were: a) disconnected from statehood; b) made into a completely subservient movement controlled by foreign agents; and, c) were made to be completely irrelevant, because in the main narrative<sup>15</sup> they were presented as the last phase of bourgeoisie resistance, the last remaining enemy forces to be rounded up.

The image of the Kulaks was the last to enter the exemplary narrative, and it came from a different area: from the official Marxist doctrine on class struggle. The first calls for writing a Marxist history of economic relationships in Lithuania were expressed in 1946 during a general meeting of the LSSR Academy of Sciences (Liekis 1993, 83-87). In 1949 a comprehensive synthesis of Soviet Lithuanian history was called for. It appeared in 1958 with Žiugžda as the chief editor. However, the socialist struggle in Lithuanian rural areas is represented very schematically, blindly following Marxist theory.<sup>16</sup> The first scholarly texts touching on the guerrilla war appeared only in the mid 1960s (Olekas 1966). They “explained scientifically” that the main class enemy of workers and peasants in Lithuanian village were the “Kulaks”, and the Bourgeoisie Nationalists, who formed armed gangs, were their offshoot. Together they created the link between local exploiters, the Kulaks, and the foreign capitalist imperialists.

---

<sup>15</sup> In which the Bourgeoisie Nationalists were first serving Kaiser Germany, then implementing policy measures against the people between the wars, and then cooperating with the Nazis, especially in carrying out mass murder, and lastly were engaged in destructive activities after the war under the guidance of foreign secret services.

<sup>16</sup> “The Kulaks, the reactionary catholic priests, the bourgeoisie nationalist elements – the agents of American and English imperialism – tried as hard as they could to stop the creation of collective farms. [...] Yet the Soviet state, having active support of the peasant masses managed to break the resistance of the Kulaks and removed this most important obstacle in the way of collectivisation” (Žiugžda 1958, 460).

As we have already stated, in order to see the impact of Soviet historical culture on the transformation of collective memory we need to examine not only the top level of it (the official discourse – Soviet exemplary narrative), but also other areas and the ways in which the exemplary narrative was implemented there. We will now consider one such area – material monuments and mnemonic practices related to monuments.

### **Implementation of the Exemplary Narrative: heritisation and mnemonic practices**

In Lithuania there were 20 monuments related to the guerrilla war (*Lietuvos TSR kultūros paminklų sąrašas 1973*).<sup>17</sup> All monuments were officially classified into two categories – those of local importance, and those of state importance,<sup>18</sup> and all of these 20 monuments were of local importance, making up 2.5% of that category. The other 757 locally important monuments and all 272 monuments of state importance were not historic artefacts in the Rankean sense. These objects were carefully selected and placed according to a Marxist scheme of history, and made up four informal groups: monuments for the 18th-century fights against the Crusaders, monuments for the 19th-century uprising “against Czarism”, monuments for the revolutionary movement,<sup>19</sup> and monuments for the Great Patriotic War. This was the basic scheme of heritisation of the official Soviet history.

The monuments placed the narrative of the guerrilla war between the revolutionary movement (against the capitalists and the kulaks) and the Great Patriotic War, which without a doubt is the most important event in modern Russian historical consciousness. The Great Patriotic War became the anchor for the topic of “rampage of bourgeois nationalists”, after the reformed topic of the Holocaust was also attached to it – reformed in a peculiar Soviet manner to mean a “massacre of peaceful Soviet citizens”, without the specific Holocaust connotations. Heritisation and the visiting of monuments were actualised in schools (celebrations of holidays), in extracurricular education (children camps), tourism (as points of interest), and the activities of the Lithuanian Society for Studies of Local Lore (*Kraštotyros draugija*), which had to collect data for building monuments.

The school was the most important area of forming the mindset of Soviet citizens, thus it was probably the most important area of enforcing the forged narrative of the Lithuanian guerrilla war. However, given the scope of the subject it will not be discussed here, as it would require more, wider research. Here we will limit ourselves to other mnemonic practices that were carried out through the tourism sector, especially through tourist clubs, and through the activities of the Society for Studies of Local Lore.

Before discussing the way in which the narrative of the guerrilla war was used in tourism, we should say a few words on Soviet tourism, and how it differed from tourism in Western Europe.

---

<sup>17</sup> Historical, archaeological, architectural, urban, and painting monuments formed the group of cultural monuments.

<sup>18</sup> Monuments of State importance signified events important to the history of Communism and the USSR.

<sup>19</sup> It included underground communist activities in Czarist Russia and in the Lithuanian Republic before the Second World War.

In Western Europe, tourism appeared as a leisure activity, together with leisure time itself, as modern society and a new understanding of work started to develop after the Industrial Revolution. The Soviet Union was a specific variation of modernisation, thus its concept of tourism was peculiar. It had two aspects or branches – the first was similar to leisure travelling and was most often called “excursions”, while the other branch that was usually called “tourism” was a leisure sport activity with an emphasis on the needs of territorial defence.

Even though the majority of the monuments under discussion were officially designated for “touristic needs” (in the sense of leisure travelling or “excursions”, as described above) and included in the registry of points of interest, we could not find any data on how they were used in preparing the routes for excursions or travelling. They were not included in the official routes. It is also impossible to say whether the said monuments were actually shown or at least mentioned during the trips. Only in one review out of hundreds (there are a lot of reviews because guides were carefully watched and reviewed) do we find a remark that there were some mentions of the post-war.<sup>20</sup>

The narrative of the post-war was used somewhat more frequently in tourism, especially in children’s and teenagers’ tourism clubs, which were the most militarised. However, even here the topic was used haphazardly. In military and patriotic education in the LSSR, the most important touristic event was the youth trip called “The glory of those days will not fade away” (*Tų dienu šlovė neišblės*), which aimed to teach the youth “love for the Motherland, and unlimited loyalty to the Communist Party and the Soviet people”<sup>21</sup> The young persons had to learn these values from examples of the heroes of the Great Patriotic War and the exemplary members of the *Komsomol*. Here, the names<sup>22</sup> associated with the guerrilla war were sometimes mentioned, but the topic of guerrilla war itself was not seen as a separate subject for tourism events, and even less as a key feature or a topic on its own.

The heritisation was without a doubt the most extensive in the activities of the Society for Studies of Local Lore. It was an umbrella organisation for amateurs active in various areas of local studies, with professional organisations and specialists, most often the science institutes (Račkauskas 1986, 2), supervising the specific topics. There were three main areas of activities: local studies, protection of monuments, and museology.

The area of recent history was under the supervision of the Institute of Party History, which like other similar professional organisations watched over to ensure the “scientific

---

<sup>20</sup> “More information on Radviliškis and its history would be welcome, as the guide mentioned a lot about the War and postwar, forgetting to mention the Lithuanian book smugglers and the effects of the Revolution of 1905-1907 on Radviliškis,” Pastabos apie ekskursiją ‘Panevėžys-Šiauliai’ kurią 1971 m. liepos mėn. vedė Panevėžio ekskursijų biuro vadovas A. Šukys [Excursion review]. In: Lithuanian Central State Archive (LCSA), R-632, ap. 1., b. 120.

<sup>21</sup> Dėl Respublikos komjaunimo organizacijų darbo toliau gerinant jaunimo karinį patriotinį auklėjimą. In: LCSA, R-632, ap. 1, b. 178b.

<sup>22</sup> For example, in 1967, most probably during the first part of the trip, a monument plaque was inaugurated and dedicated for the Komsomol members who were killed there in the post-war period, ‘Turistinis maršrutas Nr. 2 po Molėtų, Anykščių, Ukmergės ir Jonavos rajonų komjaunimo šlovės vietas’. In: *ibid*.

In 1965 during a Republican Congress, several monuments related to the post-war were used – a theatrical meeting took place in Ukmergė during which the participants brought two wreaths, and guests and veterans brought flowers, to a monument for the “defenders of the people”, ‘Respublikinio sąskrydžio vedimo tvarka (smulkus planas)’. In: LCSA, f. R-632, ap. 1, b. 178b.

soundness” of research, gave advice on methodology,<sup>23</sup> and reviewed members’ works that were published in the press and publications of the Society.<sup>24</sup> The most important order that was issued by the Institute to the Society was to collect information on those “fallen for the Soviet Government”. It was later used in various publications of the Institute. Up until 1986 the Society provided the Institute with 4322 files on such persons (Račkauskas 1986, 13-14).

In 1977 the Society created an archive of manuscripts (*Paminklų apsaugos ir kraštotyros draugijos rankraštynas*).<sup>25</sup> It periodically issued a catalogue that gives a similar overview on LSSR history, as does the above discussed *Lietuvos TSR paminklų sąrašas*, both in terms of content and the relative amount of works on “bourgeois nationalists” (*Kraštotyros darbu katalogas* 1977-1985). However, here the topic is used much more frequently than in other areas, such as excursions or tourism club activities. Furthermore, the information of the message here is much clearer. But the number of stories on “bourgeois nationalists” do not help to evaluate their authenticity. Given the extent to which the so called “soviet folklore” was being falsified<sup>26</sup> (Aleksynas 1992, 109-120; Kazlauskienė 1992, 98-108), the predominance of history topics (the data from 1986 show that 68.8% of all works<sup>27</sup> were on history<sup>28</sup>) is very suspicious.

## Conclusions

The study shows that even though we can find the specific orders by LCPCC to forge the history of the Lithuanian guerrilla war, and we can locate the specific form of the official narrative that was created on the orders of the Party, the variations in actual implementation of the official narrative show that the programme to reinterpret the Lithuanian guerrilla war was incoherent, incomplete, and was not implemented very widely. It was implemented with varied intensity in various areas. Only in the press and only in the 1970s was it carried out really intensively and purposefully.

A deeper study of one specific area of Soviet historical culture, the building of monuments and carrying out of the related mnemonic practices, show that the forms

---

<sup>23</sup> For example, in 1966 in a joint plenary session of the Excursion Executive Board, the Komsomol and the Society for Studies of Local Lore, the director of the Institute of Party History Romas Šarmaitis gave instructions on how to correctly prepare files on places of mass killings in Lithuania. ‘Drg. Šarmaičio pasisakymas.’ In: LCSA, R-632, ap. 1, 36b.

<sup>24</sup> In 1963-1991, a collection of articles *Kraštotyra* was published, and had 25 issues. In addition to these, there were special issues and issues for various occasions.

<sup>25</sup> In 1986 it contained over 2,000 manuscripts (Račkauskas 1986, 13).

<sup>26</sup> Aleksynas and Kazlauskienė disclose the decline of the folklore studies and a move towards the priorities of “Soviet folklore” with strict instructions to collect material like that and forge it in unbelievable amounts when none is found.

<sup>27</sup> About 7.2% of works were on ethnography; 11.6% on language, folklore, literature, and folk music; 1.9% on geography, history of economy, and nature studies; 6.4% on studies of monuments; 0.1% on museology; and 3.4% works covered several areas (Račkauskas 1986, 11).

<sup>28</sup> When the archive of manuscripts was presented to the public, it was explained that history section covered the history of locations and collectives, the developments of the workers’ struggle, the revolutionary past, the events of the Great Patriotic War, the building of Socialism, the development of friendship among nations, the spread of atheism, the contemporary life of collectives, and the information on famous local persons and culture, (Račkauskas 1986, 11).

and the intensity of the development of the Soviet narrative of the Lithuanian guerrilla war were poor and inconsequential. For example, if we compared this to the Soviet anti-religious propaganda, especially directed against the foremost enemy of the regime, the Catholic Church, we would find a great difference in intensity and complexity. These results support a hypothesis that the Soviet historical culture was not a decisive factor in the transformations of the collective memory of the Lithuanian guerrilla war. This suggests that in order to understand the shift, more attention should be paid to the sociological, sociohistorical, and anthropological studies of the Lithuanian Soviet society than to the specific actions of the regime.

## References

- Aleksynas K. (1992). 'Tarybinės tautosakos paieškos 1945-1947 metais'. *Tautosakos darbai*. No. 1, pp. 109-120.
- Aleksynas K. et al., (2009). *Lietuvių liaudies dainynas*. Vol. XXI: *Karinės istorinės dainos*, No. 6: *Partizanų dainos*. Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas.
- Anderson B. (1999). *Įsivaizduojamos bendruomenės: apmąstymai apie nacionalizmo kilmę ir paplitimą*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.
- Anušauskas A., Banionis J. and Bauža Č. eds. (2007). *Lietuva 1940-1990: okupuotos Lietuvos istorija*. Vilnius: Lietuvos gyventojų genocido ir rezistencijos tyrimų centras.
- Anykšta (2008). Skrebai ir banditai pokariu gyveno spintose. Oct 28th. (*After the war, "stribai" and the bandits lived in the wardrobes*).
- Assmann A. (2012). *Introduction to Cultural Studies: Topics, Concepts, Issues*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag.
- Baranauskas B. and Rukšėnas K. eds. (1970). *Documents Accuse*. Vilnius: Gintaras.
- Bogušauskas J. R. and Streikus A. eds. (2005), 'Dėl archyvinių dokumentų panaudojimo buvusiems aktyviems pasipriešinimo dalyviams kompromituoti'. In: *Lietuvos kultūra sovietinės ideologijos nelaisvėje, 1940-1990* [selection of archival documents]. Vilnius: Lietuvos gyventojų genocido ir rezistencijos tyrimų centras.
- Erl A. and Nüning A. eds. (2008). *Cultural Memory Studies. An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Figs O. (2007). *The Whisperers: Private Life in Stalin's Russia*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Gailienė D. (2008), *Ką jie mums padarė: Lietuvos gyvenimas traumų psichologijos žvigsniu*. Vilnius: Tyto alba.
- Gailienė D. ed. (2004). *Sunkių traumų psichologija: politinių represijų padariniai*. Vilnius: Lietuvos gyventojų genocido ir rezistencijos tyrimų centras.
- Gailius B. (2006). *Partizanai tada ir šiandien*. Vilnius: Versus Aureus.
- Gailius B. (2009). *1944-1953 m. partizanų karas šiuolaikinėje Lietuvos istorinėje, politinėje ir teisinėje kultūroje*. Thesis Submitted in partial fulfilment of the Requirements of Vilnius University for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Vilnius: Vilnius University.
- Halbwachs M. (1950). *The collective memory*. New York: Harper & Row Colophon Books.
- Halbwachs M. (1992). *On collective memory*. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.

- Hutton P. H. 'Sigmund Freud and Maurice Halbwachs: The Problem of Memory in Historical Psychology'. *The History Teacher*. Vol. 27, No. 2, pp. 145-158.
- Kazlauskienė B. (1992). 'Iš tautosakos skyriaus veiklos pokario laikotarpiu'. *Tautosakos darbai*. No. 1 (8), pp. 98-108.
- Kraštotyros darbų katalogas (1977–1985)*. Vilnius: Lietuvos TSR paminklų apsaugos ir kraštotyros draugija.
- Liekis A. (1993). *Nenugalėtoji Lietuva*. Vol. I, Vilnius: Valstybinis leidybos centras.
- Lietuvos TSR kultūros paminklų sąrašas (1973)*. Vilnius: Mokslinė metodinė kultūros paminklų apsaugos taryba.
- LITHUANIA. *Lietuvos Respublikos asmenų, represuotų už pasipriešinimą okupaciniams režimams, teisių atkūrimo įstatymas*. (1990) [online]. Available from: [http://www3.lrs.lt/pls/inter3/dokpaieska.showdoc\\_l?p\\_id=331928&p\\_tr2=2](http://www3.lrs.lt/pls/inter3/dokpaieska.showdoc_l?p_id=331928&p_tr2=2) [Accessed: 2 September 2014].
- Olekas P. (1966). *LKP kova už socialistinį žemės ūkio pertvarkymą Tarybų Lietuvoje*. Vilnius: Mintis.
- Račkauskas K. (1986). *Kraštotyros sąjūdžio dvidešimtpenketis*. Vilnius: Lietuvos TSR paminklų apsaugos ir kraštotyros draugija.
- Ricoeur P. (2004). *Gedächtnis, Geschichte, Vergessen*. Paderborn: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.
- Rūsen J. (2007). *Istorika: istorikos darbų rinktinė*. Vilnius: Margi raštai.
- Schatter D. (1995). *Memory Distortion: How Minds, Brain, and Societies Reconstruct the Past*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Streikus A. (2003). 'Apie antikrikščioniškus sovietinių švenčių ir apeigų tikslus'. *Naujasis Židinys-Aidai*. No. 10, pp. 514-517.
- Streikus A. (2005). 'Istorinės atminties sovietizavimo ypatybės Lietuvoje'. *Naujasis Židinys-Aidai*. No. 5, pp. 370-373.
- Streikus A. (2007). 'Sovietų režimo pastangos pakeisti Lietuvos gyventojų tautinį identitetą'. *Genocidas ir rezistencija*. No. 1 (21), pp. 7-30.
- Švedas A. (2009). *Matricos nelaisvėje: Sovietmečio lietuvių istoriografija (1944-1985)*. Vilnius: Aidai.
- Žiugžda J. ed. (1958). *Lietuvos TSR istorija: Nuo seniausių laikų iki 1957 m.* Vilnius: Valstybinė politikos ir mokslo literatūros leidykla.